IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RYAN KERWIN : CASE NO. 05-93 ERIE

:

VS. : MAGISTRATE JUDGE SUSAN BAXTER

:

LT. WILLIAM MCCONNELL : DISTRICT JUDGE SEAN MCLAUGHLIN

PLAINTIFF'S RESPONSE TO THE DEFENDANT'S STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED FACTS

1. It is denied that plaintiff did not file a grievance on July 23, 2003. (Complt. at 4) The defendant has already admitted that plaintiff filed a grievance on July 23, 2003 addressing numerous instances of threatening abuse by various correctional employees employed at S.C.I. Albion in his response ve pleading to plaintiff's complaint. (Def's. Answer at 4)

This prior admission in the defendant's responsive pleading is binding. See, Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(d) (Averments in a pleading to which a responsive pleading is required are admitted when not denied in the responsive pleading.)

See also, Wyatt vs. Hunt Plywood Co. Inc., 297 F3d 405, 411 -412 (5th Cir. 2002) (Defendant's admission in answer to plaintiff's complaint was binding and defendant was estopped from claiming otherwise.) See also, Principle Health Care of Louisiana Inc. vs. Lewer Agency Inc., 38 F3d 240, 244 (5th Cir. 1994) (A motion for summary judgement is not a pleading.)

2. It is <u>denied</u> that plaintiff was interviewed by the defendant with regard to his grievance and abuse allegations on August 27, 2003. This interview was conducted on August 5, 2003 (Cmplt. at 6) and the defendant has already admitted this fact in his responsive pleading to plaintiff's complaint.(Def's.

Answer at 6)

It is <u>admitted</u> that defendant interviewed inmates William Clark and Kenneth Valentine.

Plaintiff <u>does not have sufficient knowledge</u> to admit or deny whether or not defendant interviewed the transfer bus officers.

3. It is <u>denied</u> that the corrections officers did not harass plaintiff and it is <u>denied</u> that they did not know about plaintiff's litigation against S.C.I. Smithfield. (Cmplt. at 4 and 5; Cmplt. Exhibit A) It is also <u>denied</u> that plaintiff's inmate witness (William Clark) told the defendant that no one harassed plaintiff during the bus transfer. (Cmplt. at 10 and 11; Cmplt. Exhibit E)

It is <u>admitted</u> that defendant issued plaintiff a misconduct for "lying to an employee" but it is <u>denied</u> that defendant believed plaintiff's allegations were unsubstantiated.

4. It is <u>admitted</u> that defendant issued plaintiff a misconduct (#495879) on August 26, 2003 and that a misconduct hearing was held in relation thereto on September 2, 2003 by a non-defendant hearing examiner named Ivory Barnett.

It is also <u>admitted</u> that plaintiff requested defendant's supposed inmate witness (William Clark) to testify at his misconduct hearing and that Hearing Examiner Barnett denied this request.

It is further <u>admitted</u> that plaintiff was found guilty of the misconduct and sentenced to 30 days cell restriction, effective September 2, 2003.

5. It is <u>admitted</u> that plaintiff was issued another misconduct (#436723) by non-defendant Corrections Officer Rivella on September 22, 2003. However, it is <u>denied</u> that the misconduct had nothing to do with plaintiff's litigation against S.C.I. Smithfield (Cmplt. at 14 and 15) and it is <u>denied</u> that plaintiff broke the rules for cell restriction.

It is <u>admitted</u> that Hearing Examiner Barnett presided over the misconduct hearing, that plaintiff was found guilty, and that he was sentenced to an additional 30 days cell restriction to run consecutive to the previously issued cell restriction period.

6. Admitted.

I hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing facts are true and correct, based upon my personal knowledge and that I am able to competently testify to these facts at trial.

Respectfully submitted,

3/19/06

Date

- Bryan Herum

Ryan Kerwin DZ0246 S.C.I. Albion 10745 Route 18

Albion, PA. 16475-0002